

-6-

Steven M. Bennett  
Appl. No. 09/675,907***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 30-35 and 37-47 are pending in the application, of which claim 30 is independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 30 and 37 are sought to be amended. Claims 36 and 48-59 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

***Objection to the Specification***

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Final Office Action, has objected to the Specification because of an informality with the disclosure. Specifically, the Examiner states that on page 17, lines 6-8, an ending parenthesis is missing. Applicant has amended the paragraph that includes lines 6-8 on page 17 of the disclosure to include the missing parenthesis. Based on the amended paragraph, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first para.***

The Examiner, on page 3 of the Final Office Action, has rejected claims 37-38, 50 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Regarding claims 37-38, the Examiner states that the limitation of "a least intrusive method of communication" is not a commonly used term in the art and is not

-7-

Steven M. Bennett  
Appl. No. 09/675,907

clearly defined in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The term, "least intrusive method of communication" is found in the disclosure on page 11, lines 2-7. On page 10, line 21 - page 11, line 2, the specification indicates that the user is notified by directly phoning the user if the layer of intelligence 218 recognizes that a *high priority* item from the top database table 216 demands the user's immediate attention. The specification also indicates that example notification methods include, but are not limited to, sending email, sending SMS messages to the user's cell phone, sending pages, and placing voice calls. Specification, page 11, lines 4-7. Applicant believes that one skilled in the relevant arts, after reading the above cited passages, would know that a more intrusive method of communication is a direct phone call and a less intrusive method of communication is an email. Thus, Applicant believes that the term "a least intrusive method of communication" as recited in claim 37, is described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention, without undue effort. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner review pages 10-11 of the Specification, and withdraw the rejection of claim 37. Since claim 38 depends from claim 37, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 38 for the same reasons as indicated above with respect to claim 37.

Applicant has cancelled claims 50 and 56, rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 50 and 56 be withdrawn.

The Examiner, on page 4 of the Final Office Action, has rejected claims 51-52 and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written

-8-

Steven M. Bennett  
Appl. No. 09/675,907

description requirement. Applicant has cancelled claims 51-52 and 57-58, rendering this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second para.***

The Examiner, on page 5 of the Final Office Action, has rejected claims 48 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has cancelled claims 48 and 54, rendering this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated, on page 17 of the Final Office Action, that claim 36 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claim 30 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 36. In light of this amendment, it is respectfully submitted that claims 30-47 are now in condition for allowance.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner, on page 5 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 30-32 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,510,417 to Woods

-9-

Steven M. Bennett  
Appl. No. 09/675,907

*et al.* (hereinafter "Woods"). As previously indicated, the allowable subject matter of claim 36 has been incorporated into independent claim 30. It is believed that the foregoing Amendment renders this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider amended claim 30 and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 30, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 31-32 and 41).

The Examiner, on page 8 of the Office Action, has rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,510,417 to Woods *et al.* (hereinafter "Woods") as applied to claim 30, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,601 to Brown *et al.* (hereinafter "Brown") and U.S. Patent No. 6,324,499 to Lewis *et al.* (hereinafter "Lewis"). As indicated above, Applicant has amended claim 30 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 36. Since claim 33 depends from independent claim 30, it is believed that the foregoing Amendment renders this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the amended claims and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner, on page 9 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 34-35 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,510,417 to Woods *et al.* (hereinafter "Woods") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,601 to Brown *et al.* (hereinafter "Brown"). Applicant has amended claim 30 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 36. Since claims 34-35 and 47 depend from independent claim 30, it is believed that the foregoing Amendment renders this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the amended claims and withdraw this rejection.

-10-

Steven M. Bennett  
Appl. No. 09/675,907

The Examiner, on page 11 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 39-40, 42, 44-45, 48-49, 51-52, 54-55 and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,510,417 to Woods *et al.* (hereinafter "Woods") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US 2002/0035474 to Alpdemir. Applicant has amended claim 30 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 36. Since claims 39-40, 42 and 44-45 depend from independent claim 30, and claims 48-49, 51-52, 54-55 and 57-58 have been cancelled, it is believed that the foregoing Amendment renders this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the amended claims and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner, on page 15 of the Office Action, has rejected claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,510,417 to Woods *et al.* (hereinafter "Woods") as applied to claim 30, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,792,086 to Saylor *et al.* (hereinafter "Saylor"). Applicant has amended claim 30 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 36. Since claim 43 depends from independent claim 30, it is believed that the foregoing Amendment renders this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the amended claims and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner, on page 16 of the Office Action, has rejected claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,510,417 to Woods *et al.* (hereinafter "Woods") as applied to claim 30, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,103 to Surace *et al.* (hereinafter "Surace"). Applicant has amended claim 30 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 36. Since claim 46 depends from independent claim 30, it is believed that the foregoing Amendment renders this rejection moot.

-11-

Steven M. Bennett  
Appl. No. 09/675,907

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the amended claims and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner, on page 17 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 53 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,510,417 to Woods *et al.* (hereinafter "Woods") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US 2002/0035474 to Alpdemir as applied to claims 48 and 54, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,601 to Brown *et al.* (hereinafter "Brown"). Claims 53 and 59 have been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

-12-

Steven M. Bennett  
Appl. No. 09/675,907

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/

Crystal D. Sayles  
Senior Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
(202) 986-3179

Dated: June 6, 2005

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at:	
Fax No.: 703-872-9306	
Signature <u>R. Brown</u>	Date <u>6/6/05</u>
Rachael Brown	Date